DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 991 HE 005 550

TITLE Western Conference on External Degree Programs Proceedings.

INSTITUTION California State Univ. and Colleges, Rohnert Park. Commission on External Degree Programs.; California Univ., Berkeley. Office of Extended Academic and Public Service Programs.; College Entrance Examination Board, Palo Alto, Calif.; Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.

PUB DATE Feb 74
NOTE 48p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Conference Reports; *Educational Innovation; *External Degree Programs; *Higher Education; *Open Education; Speeches; *Universal Education

ABSTRACT

The proceedings of the Western Conference on External Degree Programs held in San Francisco, February 17-19, 1974, are presented. The keynote address discusses strategies for educational innovation, while two other speeches discuss the stresses of universalism and an interim conference report. Notes and questions from small group discussions, the conference agenda, and a list of conference participants are included. (MJM)

WESTERN CONFERENCE ON EXTERNAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

PROCEEDINGS

Sponsored Jointly By:

The Office of New Degree Programs of the College Entrance Examination Board and the Educational Testing Service

The University of California Extended University

The California State University and Colleges' Commission on External Degree Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

February 17-19, 1974
Hyatt Regency San Francisco

HE 005 550

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface - Fred A. Nelson	3
Keynote Address: "Strategies for Educational Innovation", Stephen K. Bailey, American Council on Education	5
"The Stresses of Universalism", Gerald P. Grant, Syracuse University	11
"An Interim Conference Report", Cyril O. Houle, The University of Chicago	19
Notes and Questions from Small Group Discussions	29
The Conference Agenda	38
List of Conference Participants	43
Some Participants at Work	50

PREFACE

The College Entrance Examination Board and the Educational Testing Service jointly established the Office of New Degree Programs (initially called the Office of External Degree Plans) in 1971 at the same time both organizations created the well-known Commission on Nontraditional Study. Since that time the Office has served as a clearinghouse of information through its publications and has provided other services related to the development of these new programs throughout the country.

ONDP during the past two years has been pleased to sponsor and host a number of invitational conferences to serve and promote nontraditional study in general and external degree programs in particular. One of these conferences, held at the Educational Testing Service in Princeton in June of 1972, brought together about a dozen "external degree practitioners" from around the country. Another similar conference in May of 1973, also at ETS in Princeton, found this number double to nearly thirty individuals. The Western Conference on External Degree Programs grew out of the expressed desire of that group to meet again in order to have a forum for a candid and informal exchange of ideas, problems, and, hopefully, some solutions. By holding this conference in San Francisco, the location provided a rare opportunity for individuals from other parts of the country to share their experiences with those of us here in the West.

Seventy-four individuals from many operational or nearly so external degree programs actively participated. (These conferences have grown in size in a geometric progression each year!) In order to permit the same degree of informality and candid discussion which characterized the earlier meetings, the Western Conference divided into small group discussions with specific topics for the greater part of the Conference with individuals free to participate in those topics of most interest to them. At the suggestion of Professor Cyril Houle, each discussion group was asked to generate two or three questions in descending order of importance to "put to Houle" to form the background and basis of his address the second morning of the Conference. Some recorders developed notes on the discussion rather than questions. We are happy to include in these proceedings of the Conference the questions and/or notes provided by the recorders of the various small group discussions.

We all sincerely thank Stephen K. Bailey of the American Council on Education for providing a much discussed and often praised keynote speech, and to Gerald Grant of Syracuse University for raising some provocative questions during his excellent luncheon address. Everyone at the Conference marvelled at Cy Houle's ability to weave a mass of papers, questions, and notes into a wonderfully coherent "set of answers" to those questions in the course of one long evening of preparation - even citing Pilgrim's Progress in the process! All three speakers punctuated the Conference much the same way learned

theologians might by asking the tough questions at a convention of evangelists. By providing this modest set of proceedings, we hope that those who attended the Conference, and those who did not, will profit by seeing in print these three excellent talks and the questions and/or comments from the small discussion groups.

Lastly, I would like to thank the University of California Extended University staff, particularly Patrick Healey, and the California State University and Colleges' Commission on External Degree Programs, particularly Tom McGrath and George McCabe, for their assistance in planning the Conference and for their financial support which helped to make it possible. In this joint effort we have not only served the movement towards nontraditional higher education and external degree programs, but we have also demonstrated that cooperative efforts between institutions and organizations can facilitate these same commendable goals.

I was honored to have been the recipient of an earned external degree, the Associate in Arts degree, which was presented by Don Nolan of the New York Regents External Degree Program at our concluding luncheon, in what may have been an appropriate finale to a conference on the external degree. I personally have enjoyed working with many of the people present at this meeting during the past two or three years; and I'm delighted that so many of them were able to gather, at their own expense I must add, at this important Conference. I hope that our pleasant and useful association will continue in the future.

Fred A. Nelson
Co-Director
Office of New Degree Programs
College Entrance Examination Board

STRATEGIES FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

by
Stephen K. Bailey
Vice President, American Council on Education

Bill Turnbull, distinguished colleagues -

In the 13th century, Alfonso the Wise, King of Castile, once observed, "If I had been present at the creation, I would have given some useful hints for the better arrangement of the universe."

I am intrigued by the aptness of his statement for the occasion at hand. For in a very real sense, I am present at the creation, and I do in fact have some useful hints. The creation is, of course, external degree programs, and my hints are several.

For my first hint, I repair to a cartoon in the New Yorker a few years back showing a couple of U.S. astronauts who have just exited from their space craft on a distant planet. In the foregound a naked man and woman with long ears are sitting under a fruit tree encircled by a serpent. The woman has an apple in her hand. One of the U.S. astronauts is running toward her full tilt shouting, "For God's sake, Lady! Don't!"

So my first hint about external degree programs for postsecondary education is, "Don't!" Don't that is, unless you have pondered the consequences, and taken stock of the rugged terrain between where you are and where you want to go. Let me spend a few minutes describing what I know of that terrain. Among you are experts. I am not. But I have seen enough of the wilderness, and have talked with a sufficient number of old-timers, to have I think a little feel for its characteristics. Come with me on a latter-day Pilgrim's Progress.

As you leave the Delectable Garden of the Traditional Establishment, you turn left and are faced immediately with a yawning canyon called "Statusloss Gulch". The paths are so steep and so pebbly that it is almost impossible not to lose your footing and to plunge and roll down the side of the cliff. Every time you do, when you pick yourself up, you can hear laughing hyenas guffawing hysterically at your foolishness. You shout back, "But I am a pioneer, a pioneer, pioneer." A distant echo returns, "On your ear, on your ear, on your ear!"

At the bottom of the canyon, you stumble pained and bruised toward a cave called "Caution" where you can rest -- away from the merciless sun of exposure. But you dare not rest long, because you do not really know how far you have to go. You take a swig from your canteen -- a heady elixer of faith and bravado -- and start across a barren wasteland known as "Denigration Desert". In the distance, there are mountains. The air is clear and you are suddenly elated. You can almost touch the range known as "Future Felicity". Little do you realize that the mountains are actually hundreds of miles away, and that there are fearsome hazards ahead.

One of the first hazards is the sight of bleached bones. You begin to stumble across old carcasses and the skeletons of those who have gone before you and never made it. Great carrion -- known as old academic buzzards -- are wheeling around ready to pick you clean if you falter. Only self-confidence and a belief that you are doing the Lord's work keep you going. To refresh your spirits you draw an outline in the desert of the new academic world you plan to build in the mountains of "Future Felicity". But no sooner has your sketch been completed than one of the academic buzzards screams, "Old hat!" -- and scratches his talons against your exposed belly as he wheels past. Other carrion shout in derision such slogans as "Dewey, not newy!", "Less gutsy than Pestalozzi!", and "I Lafferty with Rafferty!"

Shaken you stumble on. Tired and thirsty you are about to give up when you come to an oasis. Cool fresh water is bubbling up from a spring marked "Newman-Carnegie". You drink deep. And then to you delight you see a basket of shiny apples under a palm tree. You gorge yourself, until as you near the bottom of the basket you see something move. To your horror you realize that there are serpents at the bottom of the basket of shiny apples. The serpents' names are Meretriciousness, Garden Path, Costliness, and Untransferability of Credit. The last is a King Cobra. You start to run, but you have a nightmare panic that the serpents will follow you into the mountains of "Future Felicity". Only when you reach the foothills are you able to slay one of the serpents with a slingshot carrying the initials "CPEP/CLEP". I never did find out what those initials stood for.

Alas, my allegory has no end, for most innovators are still in the foothills of the mountains of "Future Felicity". Some are reassured by the fact that they can see a few hundred yards ahead through a substantial thicket to a few bold explorers -- a few intrepid souls. But none of them is actually and totally out of the woods, and they are as aware, as any, of the serpents that emerged from the basket of shiny apples and that still lurk in the underbrush.

To carry my allegory further would be tedious. All of us here know the difficulties of academic innovation. Part of the fun of living is dreaming dreams about what might be. Part of the sadness is the realization of the institutional rigidities, the vested interests, the threatened psyches that seem to take special delight in killing green shoots of hope. Whether the innovation is a new kind of language laboratory, an auto-tutorial system, an interdisciplinary major, an imaginative practicum, an external degree, a semester-abroad opportunity, a regional learning service, a new curricular paradigm, there are traditionalists who will try to kill it, or skeptics who will bark at it. The wonder is that live births occur at all.

That live births do in fact occur suggests that some people have in fact learned the five rules of successful academic innovation. How they were able to learn these five rules before I had even stated them is, of course, and to coin a phrase, "a mystery wrapped in an enigma".

Rule number one is "Prepare for a long struggle". Gather psychic and material resources that can sustain you after the first burst of enthusiasm has left others underwhelmed. I still believe that the four greatest words in the English language are "Hey! Why don't we . . ." For they are the

words of cooperative creation based upon shared enthusiasms. But the enthusiasms need a firm base of energy and commitment if anything much is going to happen.

Second, plan your campaign. Look hard and realistically at the hurdles to be overcome, the fears that must be tempered, the antagonisms that are predictable, the allies that you may be able to pick up along the way, the methods and instruments of communication at your disposal. Look around especially for those conservatives with a liberal tinge -- those who have enormous academic or administrative respectability yet who are not afraid of the future. These are the true midwives of successful innovations. They are rarely original types. You are the original ones. But the liberal-conservative is an indispensable blocking back. He can take out your interference. He may be a trustee, a college president, an academic dean, a department chairman. But he or she may also be a chaired professor, or even a lesser light who in a quiet way conveys the charisma of dynamic prudence. If you find such persons, latch on. Work first at convincing them.

Third, form a team. Once your campaign is planned, do not try to go it alone. For one thing, you will get tired and will need reserves. For another, early team formation gives allies a sense of participation in the developing -- the exciting -- stages of the innovation. Unless you can communicate your enthusiasm by helping others to internalize it, you will never be the beneficiary of their energy. Give them something to do -- something that when done is a visible addition to the success of the total campaign. If you can make them feel a part of something important, you are half way there. If you can make a number of them feel that they as individuals stand out a little in the collective endeavor, you have it made.

Fourth, and a corollary of the third, be willing to compromise -- with friends as well as with antagonists. Your innovation may have emerged full-blown and pristine from the recesses of your own brilliance, but it will not remain that way. Others will see flaws you never dreamed of. A few toll-gate keepers will want a chunk of your dream as the price for letting you through. Strong egos among your allies will want to piggyback their own scheme, and substitute conditions that will take some of the fun away. Unless you have zest for bargaining, unless your strings of resiliency can resonate to someone else's enthusiasms, you will never innovate successfully in the Halls of Academe.

The final rule is master the tactics of procedure. Most academic innovation involves endless clearances: departmental, divisional, administrative, legislative, financial. There are both rhetorical and budgetary arts that are peculiar to each level or segment of decision-making. You and I have seen a number of good ideas come acropper because enthusiasts were not willing to take the time and pains to understand the nitty-gritty of progress. And in a world in which federal guidelines and state coordinating councils may have much to do with the success of institutional innovation, enthusiasts must learn to negotiate these distant shoals as well as more proximate reefs.

The non-trick is that all of these various calculations must be made in a non-calculating spirit. It is as true today as it was when Matthew Arnold first penned the words that "It is not the machinery we employ, but the

spirit we are of that binds us to others." The secret to the successful conveyance of that spirit is, I believe, lodged in the interstices of my third rule: the rule of honest and constructive compromise.

Let me conclude my homilies with some personal reminiscences. As many of you know, the Regional Learning Service now being developed in Central New York by Fran Macy and Donn Vickers is an elaboration and extension of an idea that came to me as New York's Commissioner Joe Nyquist and I talked about the Regents External Degree notion some three years ago. I was able to sell the Ford Foundation on the idea of having the Policy Institute of the Syracuse University Research Corporation develop a design for an area-wide logistical service that would help potential learners tap all of the educative resources of a metropolitan region in the pursuit of Regents credits and degrees.

In retrospect, I went through three psychological states in the course of two years.

The first was the stage of euphoria. Boy! Why hadn't someone thought of this before. An area-wide service for the external degree can turn the romanticism of Illich into immediate reality: colleges and universities can be disestablished. Anyone can be educated at his own speed at times and places suitable to his own style of life. All the civic and religious and cultural and industrial facilities in an entire area can become educative instruments for the independent learner. Anyone who knows something that is academically valid can receive credit for it without having to register formally for a college course. Businessmen, bankers, labor-apprenticeship supervisors, artists, retired teachers, frustrated auto salesmen, faculty wives -- all can become parttime teacher tutors. Students can learn by TV, by cable, by audio and video cassettes, by correspondence courses, by programmed modules. When each student is ready, he can take state-wide exams normed by the State Education Department. If he passes the right combination, he can receive his degree. Academic credit can be awarded for what is learned on the job. And all this at a fraction of the costs of attending the great academic fortresses and learning places that are forcing both parents and legislatures into hock.

What a marvelous and heady dream!

The second stage was a state of despair. As we got into the problems of definition, implementation, and relationships, the whole thing became grotesque in its complexity. It became clear almost at once that someone else had in fact thought of parts of all this before: New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union -- all these had experimented over considerable years with variations of the idea of non-traditional studies, especially tied to correspondence courses and credit by examination. Some of these non-traditional activities were exciting and viable; but many problems had had to be overcome abroad and many remained. Furthermore, Australia is not the United States.

With extraordinary speed a whole series of impossible questions began to emerge:

-- Who says that the degree would be worth anything? Who will accept it? And is it not reasonable to conjecture that the more experimental, the

less acceptable?

-- How does one avoid making the external degree the most stultifying of all higher education experiences: teaching to the test; mechanical grading to state or nationwide norms established by conservative professors in order to guarantee widespread acceptability?

-- How can low-income minorities be served without making them feel that this is whitey's new device to keep them out of the main stream of the academic establishment?

-- Will people really learn on their own, or will new kinds of self-study produce the morbid attrition rates of traditional correspondence courses? Perhaps the problem can be overcome by more counseling and individualized instruction. But if we individualize instruction, do we not push costs through the ceiling?

-- How will people develop any fair sense of how far they have already come academically? Surely a simple announcement of the availability of state-wide exams is not enough.

-- How does one actually assess and validate the academic worth of non-academic experience? What in fact is academically acceptable? Is a labor-apprenticeship program in welding equal in quality to a BOCES senior year in welding, or to a six-hour course in welding at Morrisville Ag and Tech? If the answer is yes, why should not successful completers of these diverse programs receive the same college credit?

-- If one could devise a truly inexpensive way to learn outside the college walls, what would happen to the economies of campuses already sorely pressed by budget stringencies?

-- What in fact is an educated man, and should some government super-power determine what credits are acceptable for transfer purposes, or should such judgments be made helter-skelter by individual departments on the diverse campuses of the nation?

-- Who should pay how much for what academic service?

-- How can adult learners be brought up to the starting gate of college-level work?

These were some of the tough ones -- but the list is far longer. It involved front-loading costs, the availability and evaluation of teaching materials, the training of learning consultants, the computerization of records and learning opportunities. I need not string this out further. Some of you have been fighting your way out of this astrodome of pillows for a long time. The heroes are still at work, but it is easy to get discouraged.

Fortunately, there was for me a third stage -- a stage of considered and sober optimism. There are pieces of the future now visible: in the Regents External Degree Program; in Empire State College; in Fran Macy's Regional Learning Service; in Minnesota Metropolitan State College; in the several institutions that have been using materials from the Open University experiment in Great Britain, in the TAGER system in North Texas, in the granddaddy operations of University College, Syracuse, and of the University of Oklahoma; in many of the experiments represented at this conference. Some of these have already had significant impacts upon the behavior of more traditional campuses. Furthermore, the winds of technology are beginning to blow at our backs: cable, satellites, cassettes, laser platters. The great need now is adequate attention to the preparation, testing, and diffusion of software. On the big questions asked above, answers are patiently being found.

One final word. What exists in traditional higher education is not all, or even mainly, bad. Postsecondary education in this country has, in fact, produced something of a miracle. We do not have to denigrate what is in order to establish a postulate that more is needed. I submit that the great tragedy of the present is not war or inflation or the energy crisis, or our collective ecological folly: it is hunger -- physical hunger for two-thirds of the world's population; spiritual hunger for three-thirds. In a couple of years we will celebrate this nation's bicentennial. What has happened to our belief in equality, the pursuit of happiness, even (God knows in terms of recent events), the consent of the governed? Patently, our existing schools, colleges, and universities have not yet created a good society. But it is of the highest importance that we recognize that with the help of our religious and cultural institutions, our educational systems have given us an unforgettable glimpse of the good society. The mountains of "Future Felicity" are still there, and they beckon from the distance of their grandeur. Soberly constructed, external degrees and other non-traditional studies are simply devices for facilitating the journey for millions alive and unborn who would otherwise have nothing about which to dream, nothing for which to hope.

THE STRESSES OF UNIVERSALISM

by
Gerald P. Grant
Professor, Syracuse University

Thank you very much, Pat, I'm delighted to be here. When Pat Healey said I wasn't in the "External Degree Club", you ought to take that as a compliment, because, as Groucho Marx once said, "This can't be a very good Club if I'm a member".

You know, as I said to someone leaving this session this morning - someone who was enthusiastically patting Stephen Bailey on the back at what a great speech he had given - I said it was disgusting, disgustingly good, entertaining, and difficult to follow. Steve Bailey enjoys a very unique status at Syracuse University where I've joined the professorial ranks for a time - untenured. Pat actually made some reference to my previous journalistic career. It reminds me of Everett Hughes' definition of a quack: one who has a more esteemed reputation with the laymen than with his colleagues and is proud of it. And I think I fall somewhat into that category. Getting back to Steve Bailey, he is one who has the very esteemed and hallowed status conferred by the Newhouse papers at Syracuse, the morning Post-Standard and the afternoon Herald-Journal. They are not my favorite newspapers, incidentally. I was in Washington recently, and I was reading the Washington Post. It tasted so good I thought I hadn't had breakfast in years. But anyway, the Syracuse papers do have this esteemed status for Steve Bailey as a former professor. It's reserved for a very few people like Pat Moynihan and just a few others. You see this headline, "Former SU Professor Seeing the Premier", or something, you get down and you find out it's about Pat Moynihan who's now Ambassador to India. But only a few people rate that. Most professors can leave Syracuse without the Newhouse papers taking particular note of it.

But it is difficult to follow that talk this morning. I'm used to being second-billed. My ego adjusted to that a long time ago - people inviting David Riesman and getting Gerald Grant. I've coped with that for quite a while. But when the guy that's supposed to introduce me gets sick on the very same day, what are you supposed to do?

I've been doing this study with David Riesman at the courtesy of the Carnegie Corporation, and Alden Dunham in particular; and I sometimes think that I've become a specialist in the varieties of academic failure. We're looking at what we call experimental colleges and experimental movements in higher education in a broad sense. I was at St. John's College one time, which as you all know is the great books college in Annapolis. One member of the faculty there looked at me rather sternly, this was Eva Brann - an extraordinary, brilliant woman - and said, "What did you say your study was, again?" I told her and she said, "Young man, if St. John's is an experimental college then Western civilization is an experiment."

Let me begin by saying that in the last decade I have visited perhaps 150 or 200 college campuses and I've looked in some detail at perhaps a score of programs that claim to be innovative, a number of which have some external degree component. And I have thought a good deal about these issues and I must confess to you that I find very little conceptual clarity in these terms. I don't really know what non-traditional is. I don't know what inter-disciplinary is. And I don't even know what innovative is. There are a number of reasons for the lack of conceptual clarity and perhaps the overarching one is that the American college and university today is itself characterized by a lack of boundaries. One can no longer draw a clear line to show where the curriculum ends and life begins, and many in higher education wouldn't want to. The university has added on function after function (some would say aggrandized) and it has been invaded from without by foundations, government, research organizations and others who want it to do its bidding. In fact, James Coleman makes the point that the university is one of the few non-purposive corporations remaining from the Middle Ages. In his view, the principal structural fault of the university is that the academic man retains the freedom to dispose of his time as he wishes and as he did in the Middle Ages, being required only to meet his classes at a few specified hours each week. We retain that freedom in 1974 but not in the context of the medieval lecturer who lived in a community that enforced many obligations. We still earn our bread primarily on the tuition and fees of students - that's our base salary - but we are free to go consulting and researching, and, yes, even speechmaking, so that the center no longer holds or holds as firmly. But it's also a function of the expansion of the university, of the wide range of tasks it has taken on in the society and of the enormously increased variety of constituencies it serves within and without.

It is difficult to sum up or to generalize what it is that has happened in American education in the last decade or so, but I would like to try to do so and to subsume manifold trends under the headings of flexibility and inclusion. These are fairly neutral terms for what boosters may think of as experimentation or innovation on one hand and increasing equality of educational opportunity on the other. A more conservative or pessimistic observer might think of these twin shifts as loss of authority on the one hand and loss of standards on the other.

One of the greatest cliches about higher education, in my view, is the usual charge about the rigidities and glacial pace of change in academe. We are a change-oriented society in which even Mayor Robert Wagner of New York ran as a reformer in his third term, and to seem to be against change is to be against apple pie. But what impresses if one looks at what has happened in higher education has been the enormously rapid pace of change. Hampshire College outlined its plan 4-1-4 calendar of instruction in a planning document in 1966, and before it could open its doors in 1970, more than fifty colleges across the country had copied the idea. New curricula sprang up across the educational landscape. Hundreds of colleges adopted new programs in women's studies, black studies, ecology, and new forms of humanistic psychology. Fixed requirements were swept aside everywhere. Even the sociology department at Harvard eliminated the language requirement, methodological requirement, and the general examination for the Ph.D. The only requirement in the sociology department there was an oral exam - no longer a general exam -

but limited to one topic chosen by the candidate. In a little noted report published by the CEEB following a meeting of one hundred academic deans from a cross-section of American colleges and universities in 1972, it was reported that three-fourths of those colleges permitted students to define their own courses of study and arrange their majors as they wished.

Nearly as many allowed students to initiate new courses.

More astonishingly, 28% permitted undergraduates to teach other undergraduates for credit.

At a third of the institutions, independent study or work done outside the college could make up a fourth of the work done for the baccalaureate degree.

Hodgkinson's data on Institutions in Transition also confirms this flexibility. But before you think we're entirely in different worlds, I'll hasten to add that I've recently read the study that Peterson of ETS did for the legislature here in California in which he gave his Institutional Goals Inventory to students, faculty, chancellors, presidents, boards of regents, at all of the California colleges and universities - the university level, the state university and college level, the community college level, and the private level. And it was found in the rankings of what should be goals that uniformly across the board, at every level of institution, and with every institution within them, that off-campus study programs were ranked almost lowest. The only thing that ranked lowest in number of them was, as a goal, "traditional religiosity". So that there is resistance to "off campus" study, and I think some of you are encountering that. That's real, and that shows up in the data, too.

But the more general picture, as I would see it, is the one of change and flexibility. To me it renders the terms traditional and non-traditional almost meaningless. And these are only the most obvious sorts of changes. In visits to colleges across the country I've found much wider evidence of changing styles and content, hidden by unchanging labels.

Another invention of the 1960's was the teach-in which combined both of the themes I referred to here -- it had the elements of the evangelism of reform and of an egalitarian inclusiveness. The teach-ins took on an aura of a revival meeting, and passion became a principal test of authenticity, partly submerging competence. Authority relationships shifted as well as the lecture platform was shared by both students and outsiders. The usual boundaries between teachers and students were erased. The corrolary of the teach-in, of course, was the sit-in, and I have often wondered what the establishment figures who sit on the Board of Trustees at Cornell must have thought when they picked up copies of the New York Times one morning to see a picture of their president sitting cross-legged on the floor with armed blacks who had taken control of some of the Cornell buildings. That picture captured in a powerful way how usual role distances had been shortened and the old hierarchies tumbled.

These changes came as a result of, and partly in turn encouraged, the increas-

ing inclusiveness of American higher education which is doing what no nation has ever done before, which is to move towards a college level education for a majority and perhaps eventually the totality of youth. Frequently discussions about this phenomena fall into the trap of either rejoicing at the advance of a democratic educational system, or of lamenting the erosion of standards.

Yet loss of standards has, until quite recently, been more imagined than real. More on the whole has not meant worse in American higher education. The advancing wave drew in equal proportions from the upper and lower ability levels. But we are now getting to the point of drawing critical numbers of distinctly less-abled students, and, paradoxically, as ability levels have sunk, grades have risen. I spoke recently with a faculty member who described himself as having lived through three generations at a predominantly black college in the East where the average Board scores have now dropped to about 300. This was a college that once had a significant proportion of upper ability level students. They have had to import so-called remedial faculty, a racist description to some; yet by whatever name one calls such faculty, these teachers are being paid university salaries to teach skills that were formerly taught at the high school level. Faculty who teach in such programs are right, I think, to say that one cannot take a traditional high school or remedial approach. But I find that in avoiding that trap, they frequently fall into another, that of pretending that a seminar discussion can really teach students how to write vigorously and intelligently. Just as students want to be treated like their peers, the faculty in such programs are responsive to the norms of an academic community which means they want to teach literature or the theory of literature and not to do the difficult work of reading and responding to student essays.

It seems to me we know very little about the kinds of faculty who can teach successfully in such programs or about the kinds of efforts a teacher needs to make the move towards where the students are without surrendering to them.

Similarly, as I think of moving to where the students are not in a psychological sense as I intended above, but in a geographical sense, as in many external degree programs, what are the special qualities needed for successful teaching in that relationship? I sometimes think of it as the distinction between classroom teaching and project-oriented study, and I do not know myself whether the qualities of being a good teacher are universal or whether the qualities are to some degree differential according to the context. But it seems plausible, for instance, that the qualities which make some persons stimulating correspondents while others are abyssmally dull letter writers might mean one rather than the other would be more responsive to a student in a relationship where there is a great deal of written communication. Similarly, there may also be different kinds of management skills in project-oriented teaching. For example, some of my colleagues seem much better than others in disaggregating a student's project and helping him see a series of steps or tasks along a continuum. Faculty also vary greatly in their skill at placing students in productive field settings or in useful apprenticeship situations.

The inclusion of new constituencies combined with the increasing flexibility of curricular paths has placed unique strains on the advising function. Fa-

culties voted in wholesale new programs of free choice curricula without recognizing the burden of substituting individual advice for the consensual advice of the older structured programs. It also has often meant the abandonment of core curricular and the weakening of general education programs. As faculty have felt free to do their own thing, which usually means their own disciplinary thing, the number of independent studies has risen enormously, and this is often, unfortunately in my experience, a concordat of mutual neglect.

A related issue, one that has troubled me lately, is the spread of a naive egalitarianism in which we fail to recognize the real weaknesses of many students and fail to see sometimes how stressful it is for those for whom the ceiling has been suddenly lifted. This has been particularly evident to me lately with women, but also with blacks and other minorities. Faculty often fear being thought racist or elitist if they do not encourage each of these students to aspire to the highest ambitions. I have realized in several such cases that I have asked students to overextend themselves and have really given poor advice.

At St. Louis University, where they've brought in a number of poor and poorly prepared black students, I was astounded that the faculty were telling me on the one hand that they felt guilty because they were giving "C" students "B's", and the black students were saying the faculty is racist. As I visited classes I realized the sense that what both of them were saying was true. It became evident in a number of seminars where a black student would raise his hand and say something that may have been quite a ways off the mark, and the faculty member would say "Yeah, that's right. Good. Right on.", and then he'd turn to somebody else. A white student would say something, and he would immediately challenge it. The faculty really weren't teaching the black students in the same sense. They really weren't challenging their assumptions.

The most difficult thing about advising, of course, is to really do it and take responsibility for it, and I see evidence of many wishing to escape and avoid such responsibility, shielding their true motives from even themselves perhaps behind the banner of egalitarianism or of allowing everyone to do their own thing.

Now I would like to turn from the issues of teaching and advising to some larger policy questions connected with the long-term inclusive trend of American higher education.

There is a very interesting study reported in Cyril Houle's book on The External Degree, the study by Richard Peterson and Abraham Carp of the Educational Testing Service. They surveyed a national sample of adults from 16-60 and nearly three-quarters of those interviewed said there was something they wanted to know more about. Houle notes that 17% of them said they wanted formal college credit towards an A.A., B.A., or advanced degree, which is a pool of five or six million people on a national basis. What is even more interesting to me is that 53% said they wanted no credit for such learning, they just wanted to do it.

I am strongly in favor of providing the opportunity for those who wish to

earn college credit to do so. But I think we have come to a point in America where we may have gone beyond the open door to something closer to prodding or luring cattle through a gate. It seems to me that we've tied up nearly all the financial goodies the society offers to the population aged 18-24 with being a student in a formal institution of higher education. Under the BEOG Program (nowhere near fully funded yet, but the history of all such programs is that once on the books, the pork barrel fills up very quickly), students can qualify for ten to twelve thousand dollars in outright federal grants over a four-year period. But a youngster in America today cannot qualify for outright grants to open a bookstore, or to capitalize his construction firm, or to apprentice herself to a potter in North Carolina. We have structured the incentives and the statuses in such a way as to go beyond opportunity to coercion.

The hidden interest in all of this, it seems to me, is the self-interest of the professorate itself. I question the assumption that we can benefit everyone. We're the ones who benefit from an enormous proliferation of higher education. There are more jobs, more pay, and more promotion for us if there are more customers. And as the higher education system expanded, the professorate itself has become a sizable lobby and a powerful interest group in the society.

It also seems to me that we have oversold the economic benefits of higher education. Whether we have or not, we are wrong to assume that benefits will be the same as when we grow from fifty to a hundred percent of the age grade as they were when we grew from 4% of the age grade in 1900 to more than fifty percent today. The last group to enter the system is in some ways the least to benefit, although we should not overlook the benefits to society as a whole from a greater investment in education and the resulting advances in knowledge and technology and productivity. There is no question that the floor has risen for everyone in American society due in no small part to widespread availability of higher education. This is one of the factors that Christopher Jencks fails to take account of in his data. You just can't look at benefits within the nation, but you've got to compare the benefit of being in its educational system as opposed to being born in Uganda. I recognize that, but still I think we've oversold the economic benefits.

The recent slowdown in growth rates as some coercive elements, such as the draft, have been removed, seems to me a healthy thing. The reduction in faith in the economic benefits of higher education may accelerate this trend, although I note that in the Carnegie Commission survey 97% of parents said they wanted their children to have a college education. And I think Lester Thurow was right when he predicted a couple of years ago a rise in defensive credentialism; that is, that significant numbers would seek graduate degrees in order to keep the job they have rather than to qualify for a profession. I think some graduate schools, particularly the graduate schools of education, are now benefiting from that syndrome. It's a bad motive, perhaps, and my own university is profiting from it, but, of course, we don't need to respond in our teaching and our purposes to bad motives once people are in just simply because that's what brought them to our attention.

The more important thing that is happening, I think, is that it's raising new questions about purpose. Though 97% of the Carnegie parents want their child to go to college, the generation that's now in college may answer that

question very differently themselves in 20 or 30 years hence. We need to pay real attention to that, it seems to me, in terms of the integrity of the kinds of programs, experiment, innovation, and expansion that we are now promoting in the system of higher education because that's going to affect the view of this generation about its willingness to pay taxes and tuition in 2004, and its view of the efficacicusness of that system. But the really important thing that's happening now, I think, is the pulling away of the old simple economic benefit argument. It is going to force a very serious reevaluation and reconsideration of the rationale and purposes of higher education.

Most of the experiments of the 1960's were concerned with the two themes I have highlighted here - flexibility and inclusion. Both of these reforms have been largely administrative and structural. They have slowly forced our attention to necessary adaptations and changes in process and content, and there is now a serious winnowing of the intelligent and useful from the merely faddish in many reforms. In some places, of course, the pendulum has swung far to the right, and there has been a poojahist spirit in some faculties.

But there has been less attention to content and to purpose than there might have been. The Carnegie Commission paid very little attention to such issues seldom discussing purpose and discussing content very little even in a major volume of the Commission edited by Carl Kaysen entitled Content and Context. It is only in the last year or two that Harvard, Columbia and Chicago began efforts to rethink their general education programs. Some of the most interesting attempts to respond to the question of content and purpose are what is happening at Santa Cruz, at St. John's (hardly new, but much more visible of late), Lindisfarne and the College of Human Services, and Antioch.

I think of these colleges as varieties of academic counter-revolutions, the basic revolution in American higher education being the emergence of the American University on the German research model in the way that Laurence Veysey has described in his brilliant book. That was the revolution which overturned the 19th century American liberal arts college and established the dominant pattern of the increasingly specialized and technocratic and ever-expanding American multiversity. I would be happy to talk more in the question period about these counter-revolutions and their purposes as I see them. What is interesting about them in this context, however, is that they are very distinct communities, whereas external degree programs, although they do not have to be, frequently strike me as the final step of a role segmentation, the final explosion in extremis of the traditional expansionist technocratic university, the ultimate fracture of the polis, and the triumph of the multiversity model. In that sense external degree programs are traditionally expansionist. I would not go so far as to say little of what is best in higher education can remain if we abandon physical community. (It seems to me, for example, there can be such a thing as psychological community that does not need to be geographically circumscribed.) But it does raise for me the question of what form the rewards for faculty take in such a setting. What are the norms that reinforce good teaching? Where do faculty get their applause? Similarly, what happens when students lose the benefits of membership in an intellectual community, if they do? Alternatively, how does one create that community in dispersion?

AN INTERIM CONFERENCE REPORT

by
Cyril O. Houle
Professor of Education, The University of Chicago

Late yesterday afternoon by the duly appointed hour most of the reporters for the small group discussions had delivered their reports. Others came in a bit later, but one did not appear until about fifteen minutes ago. Excluding that lone exception, and any others which may still be scattered at various places in the audience, the results showed that 71 separate questions had been presented for my comment, and that, in addition, there were a number of approval-seeking queries, the kind that begin with the words "Isn't it true that" or "Do you not agree that".

It had been my intention to sort the questions out into piles and deal with categories, or, if that could not be done, to deal with one question from each category. This course of action proved to be impossible, for broad themes were simply not discernible, at least to my by-then bleary eye. I felt a sense of desperation like that expressed by a William Saroyan character in The Time of Your Life, whose only words, repeated throughout the play, are "No foundation all the way down the line".

Ultimately it became clear, however, that the comments and the questions taken as a whole did seem to express a certain tone or attitude. Some were profound, some were trivial, and they certainly expressed or implied a wide variability of opinion. Yet they were characterized by a wholesomeness, a stability, and a strength which seemed heartening. The vague euphoria which has often characterized the discussion of the external degree was not wholly absent, but it was a minor theme. And the posture looked forward rather than back.

This viewpoint is profoundly different from that expressed by a distinguished sociologist and administrator, Robert Nisbet, in The Degradation of the Academic Dogma, a book which I greatly admire for the power of its argument and the elegance of its expression of a point of view. Professor Nisbet believes that until the 1940's, American higher education was held together by a point of view shared by faculty and administrators which accepted certain principles and ways of work as being inherently valuable and which needed no reference to authority or proof. He would like us to turn back to the acceptance of that dogma and rebuild our system according to the earlier principles which once gave it coherence and meaning.

With all due respect for the significance of his book, most of us here would find difficulty in adopting its course of action. Everywhere we look we see that the fundamental principles and practices of higher education - almost all of which were invented in the last quarter of the nineteenth century - have individually lost any rational meaning and collectively present a picture of confusion and inconsistency. What is the true meaning of: residence; credit; distribution and concentration of courses; organized depart-

ments of instruction: the distinction between lower divisional, upper divisional, and graduate work, and the water-tight compartments and specializations into which knowledge is now separated. The general sense of unreality of terms and concepts was illustrated for me the other day when I talked to a junior at an excellent college. She had just returned from a semester's trip around the world with nineteen fellow students and two professor-chaperones. I asked whether this journey counted toward her degree. She said that it certainly did, and I gained the impression that the fifteen semester hours had somehow been distributed among several departments of instruction. "Furthermore", she added, "it counts for residence credit".

This unreality of approach in which the new is fitted into the Procrustean bed of the old seems to be strongly rejected by those who have attended the Western Conference on External Degree Programs or, at least, by the reporters for the small group discussions. They are alike in wanting to examine new forms, new principles, and new procedures.

The strength of the external degree is that it is a complex idea which is being worked out in remarkably different ways in myriad places. Our total group contains people centrally concerned with each of the three generations of the external degree. The first generation is the extension degree in which customary courses are offered off the campus, at unconventional hours, or by novel means of instruction. The second generation, the adult degree, is designed specifically for mature men or women who can use their existing knowledge and experience, but can fit the learning undertaken into the interstices of a life devoted primarily to work and to home. The third, the assessment degree, throws a heavy weight upon the learner. The institution says, in effect, "We don't really care where you learned what you need to know, or how you learned it, but we want to measure the consequences of your learning to be sure that you meet the test of what we define as the degree you're seeking". In the small groups, people were talking, in some cases consciously, and in other cases without being aware of it, of all three kinds of degrees. It is not surprising that there was some lack of a common orientation.

What further complicated the discussion is that there are at least six different administrative frameworks in which the discussants are working, or are hoping to work, or are thinking about it. Each administrative framework has its own set of problems. Most of the questions raised and many of the wise things said relate to only one framework. These are the six: an established private institution struggling to survive or to maintain a place for itself; a single, free-standing, well-established public institution which is trying to do the same thing; a single institution in a multi-campus network of institutions; a multi-campus network of institutions, some of which are trying to create programs out of their own fabrics and frameworks; a new institution, either public or private, created to offer the external degree; and a separate governmental department with only assessing and degree-awarding functions. Along with the representatives of these six frameworks, we have among our number many non-institution-based facilitators: legislators and legislative advisors; foundation executives, and the representatives of agencies which have been, or hope to be, important in the growth of the external degree idea, such as the Carnegie Foundation, the College Entrance Examination Board, the Council for the Progress of Non-Traditional Study,

the Educational Testing Service, the Office on Educational Credit of the American Council on Education, and the American Council on Education itself.

What could be done with more than seventy questions which could not be categorized into groups and whose ranking of importance varied greatly from one kind of institution to another? This problem gave rise to much panic-stricken thought as I picked up and put down again the basic lists of questions and the abortive clusterings of topics which, by that time, occupied every horizontal surface in my room. In some desperation it finally occurred to me that it would be best to follow the example of Johnny Carson's highly spurious Oriental mystic, Karnak, who gives the answer and then the question to which it responds. So here are some answers; my practice will differ from Karnak's - I will permit you to guess the questions.

A first answer is develop a synergism. This useful term, borrowed from physiology, indicates a cooperative action of discrete agencies such that the total effect is greater than the sum of the separate effects taken independently. In medicine the term might be used to indicate a therapeutic program which has several components, all of which must be followed if the desired result is to be achieved. A degree program should be built on the idea that the ultimate effect is a harmonious whole which does not reach completion merely by adding up its various parts, but which requires that they must be effectively interrelated to one another in some meaningful fashion. Thus the M.D. conveys a meaning far more powerful than would the accumulation of a group of courses in the biological sciences.

Of all degrees, the baccalaureate is probably the hardest to define. Cardinal Newman had one idea, John Stuart Mill had another, Charles W. Eliot had a third, and the president of a modern land-grant university might have still another. A first effort in the development of an external degree should be the creation of the desired synergism and the use of careful thought in determining how it may be created. Implicit in this latter decision is a consideration as to whether the new degree is to be an adaptation or adjustment to the existing structure, or whether it is completely innovative in its form and in the system of assessment which evaluates its accomplishment.

A second answer is use both summative and formative evaluation. We are all familiar with summative evaluation in which the expected product is defined at the start of an educational program, often by the use of behavior-oriented objectives, and the student is then measured at the end of the program or some part of it to see whether he has accomplished the goals originally set out for him. Formative evaluation permits a continuing interaction, shift, and development between educators and learners with an intermittent flow back and forth between evaluation and the remission of goals. Practically, and in a simple fashion, teachers and administrators do formative evaluation continuously, though they may not recognize that fact. But just as modern psychometricians have developed refined instruments to measure summative learning, so the techniques of formative evaluation are now being worked out. Both summative and formative evaluation are important, particularly since the former holds true to the essential idea of the synergism and the latter makes possible the incorporation of changing goals and procedures into the over-all evaluative plan.

A third answer is assume that no innovation in mode or method will succeed

unless it is economically adaptable to the individual learner and teacher. We have had many technological innovations in American higher education, but only a few have been well developed and widely spread. The others at first sound promising, but have within them the danger - sometimes hidden, sometimes blatant - of diffuseness and the lack of individualized meaning.

Among the innovations in educational technology which have been outstandingly successful are photographic reproduction (sometimes known as xerography), audiotapes, L.P. records, and paperback books. In every such case the technology available permits or encourages the variety essential to individual learning. There is no need to elaborate how flexibly useful xerography has been. The L.P. record makes inexpensively serviceable a spectrum of sound, often in multiple versions, which has never been available before. Since about 1953 the number of different titles of books published in the United States has tripled. Almost everybody seems to have a cassette or other type of audio-recorder. The new techniques of learning and teaching will prove to be valuable only insofar as they can be made useful to individual learners and teachers. The rest of them will never have the impact which their sponsors advocate.

As it has been in the past, so will it be in the future. The stereopticon, the magic lantern, the opaque projector, the silent or sound motion picture, the radio, or the television program; none of these have been adapted for use by the individual learner and teacher. We have had high hopes for cable television, but they are still far from realization. Eventually a home or office might have 80 or more channels and they might allow two-way communication. Such news is initially exciting, but only because multiplicity of stimulus and response leads to individualization. Gradually, slowly, and regretfully, my own hope for cable television has dwindled until it has virtually disappeared. It may be an instrument for entertainment, for the display of wares, and for the education of a few specialized audiences in highly restricted geographic environments. But as yet the heavy outlay of funds for the establishment of the system do not seem to connote the variety and diversity which is required for individualized education as it is provided, for example, by the book, the audiotape, or xerography.

A fourth answer is adapt well worked-out patterns of program design not previously used in degree programs. Those who administer higher education have available techniques and designs which have already been proved to be successful and which would be extraordinarily useful in external degree programs. To save you time, let me give a single example. The discussions yesterday dealt with what were called "remote centers" in which home campuses set up distant learning units. In these discussions many questions were raised as to how to provide support, how to train staff, and how to administer the framework. With but one exception, these many discussions ignored the existence of the Cooperative Extension Service. This system, originially contemplated as early as 1845, was created by Seaman Knapp in 1903, was perfected in 1906, was initially disseminated by a group of foundations, and was eventually enacted nationally into law in 1914. It is larger today than ever before, with perhaps 15,000 professional workers and an annual expenditure of a quarter billion dollars. Its "remote centers" exist in virtually every county in the United States. Each is staffed with one or more county agent who have general expertise in agriculture, home economics, or some other body of content. These generalists are supported by trained special-

ists who ordinarily go from the land-grant college campus into the field when they are needed. Here in California, with its extremely diverse agriculture, the specialists are often parts of the county staffs.

Why do we need to re-invent this whole system? It has been growing for 70 years and has been nation-wide for 60. It is - and from the beginning always was - a part of the work of the university system. The influence of this direct service to the adults in the community has brought a group of remote cow colleges into national prominence and has taken some of them into the hallowed precincts of the Association of American Universities.

A fifth answer which Karnak might give is develop cooperation on specific projects, not on broad general principles. The groups yesterday did a lot of talking about how to work together or how to harmonize programs within existing systems. The topics of multi-state consortia, of colleges designated to carry out programs for an entire system, of new systems to parallel existing ones, and of "pilot projects" to be undertaken by each of a number of campuses operating within a system: these and many other topics were discussed. The notion seems to be that somehow cooperation must be omnicompetent, dealing with all aspects of a degree system - or it is nothing. Yet before our eyes is the Central New York Planning Consortium for the External Degree Program which draws together the support of a number of institutions for a particular function: the guidance of students. Once the students accept the guidance, the Consortium acts as their advocate. Around that function, which I hope will become universally available, can be created a kind of cooperation which would be impossible if people are not willing to cooperate on one task unless they can cooperate on everything.

Another answer is use for your new programs the same sources of funds which have always supported education. They are: taxes, student fees, endowment income, gifts and grants, and a great variety of other forms of direct expenditure. In addition, there are indirect subsidies of the sort that economists talk about so much these days: the foregone income of students, volunteer service, and the use of inexpensive machines to do kinds of things that expensive people cannot do as well. In many places, the external degree may support at least part of the cost of the internal degree. If a university has a wide range of programs, it can charge what the market will bear for a master's degree in management, using the profit for some other purpose. Some college and university presidents do not differ greatly from W.C. Fields in his belief that one should take from the rich and give to the poor. When he was asked, "What poor?", he answered, "Us poor!"

Yet another answer is assume that accreditation procedures are going to change in response to new degree-awarding patterns. Much of the discussion yesterday implied that the accreditation agencies (regional, national, and special) were going to sit undisturbed in their present seats of power, in no way changing their policies and practices. Those who guard the gates of accreditation are as well aware of the problems of the present system as are those who administer in institutions which are trying to change it. Initially the guardians of accreditation may not move as rapidly as we wish they would, but they are (on the whole) intelligent men and women. They know the shifts and changes of American education with a depth of understanding which many other people, concerned only with the survival of a single institution, cannot match.

Another answer is if you are developing a new degree program, always recognize that you are entering a force field and enter it with either guile or force, whichever will best succeed. Stephen Bailey's advice yesterday was the best which can be given. He recommended that we use guile wherever we can. All of us realize that this is a good principle, particularly if you are as wily as he is about using it. But sometimes you have to develop strength. You have to find out who your friends are; you have to help friends on the issues that they think are important; you have to find out who their enemies are and work against their enemies; you have to find out who your enemies are and get your friends to work against your enemies; and you have to use all the other techniques of power politics. The external degree will not be ultimately successful without a policy which combines both guile and force.

My final answer is assume that nationally there is an expanding market for degrees. Yesterday a good many people talked as though the number of people who want degrees is limited. If the cake is cut up in a new way, some of the people who are used to the traditional apportioning of the pieces will lose out. This fact is not true. There is an expanding market for degrees nationally. But this market is not uniformly distributed; every college and university must identify its clientele and the market which that clientele offers. A college may serve a city or a region or a state or a number of states or the nation or the world. Some successful non-traditional programs have been based on each of these areas of service.

Nobody who has ever started an external degree program has reached precisely the audience he thought he was going to get. But every creative person has an idea of the audience at which he aims; he may later puzzle about his failures, but in most cases he can also puzzle about his unexpected successes. The very creation of new degree programs will help to create the market for them. People cannot buy a product which is not available for purchase, or about which they do not know. Once it is for sale, people will buy it who were never expected to be potential purchasers. Here lies one of the perpetual and continuing fascinations of the creation of the external degree.

These were the answers; anybody who wants to see the questions which gave rise to those answers may do so. Now for my conclusion.

We seem to be a group of people who are working within the system, but who want to adapt it. The fresh, new growths represented here will in time flourish and supplant old patterns. Doubtless, later on, as we succeed, we will in turn create new dogmas and they will perhaps turn out to be as irrational as the academic dogmas about which Nisbet speaks.

During the last quarter of the 20th century and the first quarter of the 21st, our task is to confront dogma, to create new audiences, and to develop the kinds of patterns that are needed. It is this capacity to change constantly while still basically remaining the same that has made the university the oldest institution in our society other than the Roman Catholic Church, within which it first flowered. This institution gradually drifted into existence in the 10th and 11th century, took form in the 12th century, and has now spread from its begginnings in Salerno, in Bologna, and in Paris to reach all around the world. It has remained fundamentally the same because of its capacity constantly to regenerate itself, to rethink its values, to develop new ideas, and, when those ideas become indefensible dogmas, to thrust them aside.

In Mr. Bailey's address yesterday, which all of us so greatly admired, he talked about the rugged terrain that we traverse. While he did mention the Delectable Mountains in the distance and suggested that we might pass by a few Newman-Carnegie Springs (the juncture of those names is a mystery to me), the main thrust of his comments was about the immediate dangers we face. He talked about Denigration Desert, about Status-Loss Gulch, and about other perilous routes we must follow. We faced a gloomy picture.

Everybody above a certain age knows the origin of his metaphor: John Bunyan's The Pilgrim's Progress. What Dr. Bailey did not do was to remind you of the final words of the book. They are worth considering.

> When the day that he must go hence was come, many accompanied him to the riverside, into which as he went he said, "Death, where is thy sting?" And as he went deeper, he said, "Grave, where is thy victory?" So he passed over the river, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side.

May I hope for each of you who have ardent plans for the external degree that eventually many will accompany you, that trumpets will sound for you - and that both will happen before you reach the other side.

Discussion

Question: I was struck by your first point about the synergism. I think many of us are trying to create new programs with a purpose of offering more options, more self-choice, more self-direction for learners, more alternatives. One of the products of that is to give the learner a smorgasbord and say, "Eat". Many of us avoid writing a menu for feeling that that is, in some way, simply more dogma. I'd like to hear you speak more of that. Some of us are groping for certain very basic competencies which cannot be counted as merely 120 semester hours, or 32 months of instruction. Some of us are saying that the student himself must design the whole that is greater than the parts, while others are simply saying 120 semester hours will do it. Do you have any further thoughts on that?

Answer: Cafeterias and smorgasbords provide us a bountiful choice, but before going to the table we need to know the essentials of a good diet. Sound nutrition calls for the provision of a balance of kinds of food. Every individual ought to have some proportion among the things that he or she consumes. That is why the adult needs counselors so much and why the Center in upstate New York which you administer, Mr. Macy, is so very important. Presumably you work with the student to try to help him design the kind of balanced meal which provides a synergism for him so that he does not eat only one kind of food. The notion that the degree is nothing more than an additive mechanism without any internal design and without any unified whole is, it seems to me, a pernicious one. Many different degrees may be offered within an institution; in each case, the student, or the student and the counselor, or the institution itself, ought to have some idea of the balance and the pattern of the learning experiences which the student undertakes.

Question: Do you think that Bob Nisbet's view of the university is a dead one?

Answer: I greatly admire Professor Nisbet's book; its widespread acceptance

helps confirm my judgment. But while his analysis of the past and of the present is brilliant, his prophecy of the future is less so. We cannot accept dogma as a feasible alternative to reason, we cannot return to the past, and the argument for either view makes me feel uncomfortably distrustful.

Question: Could you say a few words more about the mobilization of force which you mentioned. As I have looked around both Washington and New York for the resources of mammoth armies, I don't find them. It seems to me that the reason why some of us put as much weight as we do on guile and wile is because at the moment we cannot find the peculiar amalgam that will pull a political force together that is overwhelming. I would suggest to you that in a lot of states, and also at the national level, those who presently enjoy some degree of political power tend to be those who are unhappy about being chiefs. Therefore it takes a very substantial imagination and more staff and men to go with it to project what might be put together, even imaginatively, in terms of what you call "force". If you can suggest to us some ways of mobilizing force in this area, I'd be absolutely delighted.

Answer: Those of you in the back of the room have indicated that you could not hear the question just put to me by Mr. Bailey, who, I might comment, is the former mayor of a city, a dean, and a man elected by the legislature of the state of New York to be a member of the Board of Regents. He asks me, a far less sophisticated person than himself, how to mobilize force for the development of the external degree. I have already said that guile and wile is the best way, partly because our former students do not yet make up many legions. In the last four years, however, we have had remarkably fortunate initiatives taken by foundations, by other facilitive organizations, by government, by educational institutions, and by such leaders as yourself to give us the developmental resources in which we could test and prove our ideas. As we grow in number and as our students increase, it seems inevitable that if we do a good job, people will turn to us. Force arises from the demonstration of the excellence of the program we provide and the use of the strategems that I mentioned in my talk. Ultimately we must go directly to the state legislature and the federal congress to find effective spokesmen who can give us the help we need. Sometimes we must confront opposition. When that is true, we must bring together all the talents we can. Sometimes, even so, we shall lose. But we have already collected a group of articulate spokesmen who have been through our programs - and the numbers will grow.

Let us reflect yet again about the Cooperative Extension Service. From about 1845 until 1906, efforts were made to turn farming from a primitive folk-culture into an operation in which the farm manager could be an effective executive. Techniques were finally perfected which were applicable throughout the country. When the Service began to move out into the field, to establish its representatives, to sponsor remote instructional centers, and to have staff members constantly at work (particularly at a time when rural people were over-represented in state legislatures), American confidence grew in the land-grant colleges. They proved they were institutions which knew how to do their job. The net result was that sufficient power was generated both in the legislature and in the federal Congress to turn such colleges as Michigan State or Purdue into enormous universities. This process occurred, for the most part, against the majority opposition of the

local farmers. Posses waited at county lines to keep the new county agents from entering. There was no discernible sweetness and light. But in the long run, the remote cow colleges became accepted as leaders of American higher education.

Question: How can the application of force be used in the small college around the particular campus?

Answer: Dr. Bailey's suggestion of wile and guile is by all odds the best way to proceed. Usually institutions are regenerated from within. What Dr. Bailey has suggested was that we should find the people who, while having achieved status through some form or other of the current situation, still have their eye on the future. Those of us who are interested in the external degree must try to make allies of such people and then try, through the processes of committee and senate negotiation, to win our way through to success by study and planning and persuasion. As in every other case, success does not come easily and victory is always far from certain. One reason many innovators lose is that their college closes before the necessary reforms are put into effect. The threat of death or dismemberment does exist and has already been widely experienced.

But let me not end on this negative note. The times are in favor of change, but we must find ways to be sure that as we move forward, more and more of our colleagues will accompany us and that sometime not too far in the future we shall hear the sound of trumpets.

NOTES AND QUESTIONS FROM SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Evaluation of Non-Traditional Degree Programs

Group Leader: Leland K. Medsker, Project Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California
Recorder: Jerry Miller

1. What sort of an evaluation scheme is needed to serve the internal management needs of nontraditional degree programs?

2. What sort of an external evaluation scheme is needed to serve non-traditional degree programs (accreditation, funding agencies, state agencies, etc)? Are 1 and 2 mutually exclusive, identical, or overlapping?

3. Should both types of evaluations concentrate on how well the program is meeting its objectives?

Assessment of Students

Group Leader: David E. Sweet, President, Minnesota Metropolitan State College
Recorder: Ernie Kimmel

1. Who has the final authority for defining what is acceptable for a degree?

2. Through what process do you develop a concensus on what is adequate evidence that competencies/criteria have been achieved?

3. What is the role of a student in the assessment process?

Cooperation Among Programs

Group Leader: Donald J. Nolan, Coordinator of Academic Programs in Higher Education, The University of the State of New York
Recorder: John R. Valley

1. How many external degree programs should there be? This general question picks up many sub-questions - does each have to duplicate N.Y. Regents Degree or Thomas Edison College? Do we need to have as many individual college efforts as are now emerging? How adequately are the various efforts that are now known going to meet the total needs of the non-traditional students?

2. What are the service components of external degree programs in which cooperation is possible, desirable, likely, unlikely? By service components we mean, for example, : test administration, student assessment,

counseling and advising, test development, student recruitment, delivery of instruction, instruction or curricular planning and development, student financing or financing programs.

Quality Control

Group Leader: Kay J. Andersen, Director, Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Recorder:

1. Does an external agency such as an accreditation association have the right to question the mission of an institution?

2. Isn't the quality of a non-traditional program tied in closely with the mission of the institution?

3. If the quality of a program occurs at the time of interraction of the student and instructor, doesn't this exclude the authority for quality control being in the hands of one person (department chairman) or group on home campus?

Remote Learning Centers

Group Leader: Thomas H. McGrath, Chairman, California State University and Colleges' Commission on External Degree Programs
Recorder: Joseph Zelan

I. Issues

A. Definition of "remote"

Discussion was, in fact, on teaching at a distance, rather than narrowly about remote centers. (Modes of delivery are discussed below.) "Remote" refers not necessarily to geographic distance, but to anything which is not "one's own turf". Thus, residents of a ghetto adjacent to a middle-class university are potential users of a "remote center".

B. There was much discussion of the "failures" in programs (e.g. high attrition) which rely heavily on impersonal delivery systems and neglect personal contact (also echoed in G. Grant's talk). However, the effective (and cost-effective) use of impersonal, self-instructional systems can free resources to be used for increased personal contact - the best system is one which utilizes machines to do what machines do best and frees people to do what people do best.

C. There is no dearth of devices for delivering instruction at a distance. But cost-effective systems are scarce. TV is not currently cost-effective (open broadcasting) and effective cable-TV is years off. WATS (telephone) is currently cost-effective.

D. Even for relatively cheap systems, funding is still a problem for many institutions (e.g. cost of microwave transmission system).

E. Criteria for location of remote centers need to be established (e.g. size of population for a single center).

Remote Learning Centers (continued)

F. Joint use of facilities by many institutions a necessity in sparsely populated areas (e.g. universities, colleges, community colleges).

G. A new problem: gasoline shortage. It will be more difficult to move people around (e.g. faculty).

II. Modes of delivery; Structures

A. Cost effective modes are
   1. Telephone (WATS)
   2. Ultra-microfiche (in use at University of South Africe)
   3. Slide projectors and audio cassettes

B. The obstacle in use of above is the design of software: availability of people who can design effective instructional systems using these.

C. Need to identify non-academic people in community who have competence to serve as "adjunct faculty" in remote centers.

D. Resource persons ("information specialists") in community who can direct students to the academic help they need (in Central N.Y. Consortium, these are intensively trained, part-time consultants, each of whom carries a "case-load" of assigned students).

Assessment of Students - II

Group Leader: James W. Hall, President, Empire State College
Recorder: Ernie Kimmel

1. What should be the relationship among the functions of:
   A. assessment
   B. validation - the award of credit
   C. accreditation?

2. What are the educative functions of assessment?

3. Will the external degree movement lead to an increased emphasis on assessment by external agencies? What are the pro's and con's of such a trend?

Remote Learning Centers - II

Group Leader: Peter P. Smith, Director, Community College of Vermont
Recorder: Ron Lee

I. Peter Smith raised question of how much "community" does a "school" or remote campus need?

A. If we "concoct" nothing, does anything happen in a community?

B. Perhaps our students are already in a community. Improves (our school) student's relationship with existing community?

C. What is a "remote learning center"? Perhaps: anyplace away from main campus.

D. Frequent communication with main campus? (Phone calls, visits, common agenda?) (Group situation - sense of living and learning together?)

Remote Learning Centers - II (continued)

E. Must see the strength of the "90%" of the time students are involved in their own community. Not intervene too strongly. Students probably interested in our "educational community" only 10% of their time.

F. Cal State encourages students to get together for Group project. Helps form a sense of community via a natural grouping.

G. Northern Colorado University "ties" the remote center to the main campus by using the very same faculty. Two different communities, but the same faculty.

II. Need for "Service" at Remote Centers

A. Need to "tie" to a research or a library service.

B. Need to provide a library. Provide bibliographies to libraries, etc., who become experts on external degree programs. Bibliographies for CLEP tests, for instance. Some will be ready for '75-'76 academic year.

C. Use of local travelling experts as counselors.

III. Costs for a Remote Learning Center

A. U.C. will start one at Ventura. Will be $50,000 budget (considered minimal). One full-time counselor, administrative employee. Eventually 500-1000 students. Costs depend on extent school wants to reach out to students. Also lower if one doesn't have physical learning center. But logistics cost money, too.

IV. Travelling Centers.

A. Airplanes

B. Motor homes

V. Communications link

A. TWX

B. Telephone

C. Two-way television or picture phone

VI. Synthesis

A. Determine needs of your particular group of students.

B. Determine nature of personnel. What role does coordinator play? How do we train (and select) coordinators?

Questions:

1. How does one train the people who represent the University at a remote center? By "people" we do not mean the lecturers or instructors, but the administrative, counselor people.

2. How do we determine the "barriers" inherent in our external programs? Are we willing to live with these barriers? A program is generally focused on one or more groups. Does this focusing pose barriers to other groups?

3. How should external programs be funded? And how should it be spent? Travel? Telephones? Mail? Teaching costs? What is the student's role in deciding how it should be spent?

Cooperation Among Programs - II

Group Leader: James D. Brown, President, Thomas A. Edison College
Recorder: John R. Valley

Cooperation Among Programs - II (continued)

1. The second session on cooperation would like to have you react to the question of why cooperation is necessary. The group seemed to feel that the range of needs to be met was so great that cooperation among programs was critical. They would like your perspective on this issue.

2. Also, how can cooperation in the use of program materials - courses, course materials, etc. - be developed recognizing evidences of faculty resistance? The group felt that many kinds of courses - particularly those that involved newer technology - were expensive, so much so that their development would be prohibitive unless they would be widely used. So what suggestions do you have to deal with faculty resistances to the use or endorsement of such courses?

3. In the second session, as well as the first, the groups talked at length, and came back several times, to issues of transferability of credit. There is concern that credits awarded in new programs will not be recognized. There is worry too that perhaps solutions to this problem might be legislated. There seems to be a tension between local autonomy and justice for the student.

Counseling and Advising Services

Group Leader: Fred O. Pinkham, Director, Capital University Center
Recorder:

I. Counseling role is expanding:
   A. Help individual sort out goals
   B. Help individual plan an educational program
   C. Help individual gain placement at appropriate points in curriculum
   D. Help individual as he proceeds through program
   E. Help individual get into further education or a job

II. How do we get the faculty or registrar to grant sufficient authority to the counselor to make the kind of decisions required of him in his expanded role, e.g., award credit for life experience?

III. What kind of training is required to equip counselor to do his job?

IV. How do we provide counseling to the student before he comes to the institution? How does he know which institution is the right one for him?

V. To what extent should faculty do the counseling - or "professional" counselor?

Funding of External Degree Programs

Group Leaders: Alden Dunham, Executive Associate, Carnegie Corporation and Dale M. Heckman, Program Analyst, Department of Finance, State of California
Recorder: Robert Gene Jones

Questions posed by Mr. Dunham:
1. What are actual costs? Currently no good cost figures component by component are available.

Funding of External Degree Programs (continued)

2. How are these costs figured?

3. Who should assume development costs?

4. Who should assume operational costs?

5. Should programs be self or public support? Rationale?

6. Cost sharing through consortia?

Questions directed to Professor Houle:
1. Is the external degree a way to relieve fixed costs?

2. Is the external degree a way of support for conventional campus programs?

Funding of External Degree Programs - II

Group Leader: Adrienne Bailey, Program Associate, The Chicago Community Trust
Recorder:

1. What can we expect from new fringe-benefit arrangements for employed adults that would facilitate learning?

2. How can government educational financial policies be extended to the part-time student?

3. Where will the money come from for support of software development?

Evaluation of Non-Traditional Programs - II

Group Leader: Leland Medsker, Project Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California
Recorder:

1. What should be the balance between external and internal evaluation? To what extent is this politically necessary?

2. Do specific goals, such as increased access, change the evaluation expectations? How can changing goals be incorporated into evaluative plans hen intentions of institutions change from original purpose?

3. To what extent must overall evaluation examine or question the basic mission of a college?

4. Will new programs bring about important changes in regional accrediting ideas?

5. Are certain elements of the evaluation process more important at this stage? Are there priorities?

Relationships to State Governments

Group Leaders: Kenneth B. O'Brien, Coordinating Council for Higher Education and Bruce Fuller, Joint Committee on the Master Plan
Recorder: Fred A. Nelson

1. How does or should state governments relate to external degree programs?

2. Who, at the state level, should plan, coordinate, and fund new public and private external degree programs?

3. What responsibility does state government have in insuring "quality" of external degree programs (or "consumer protection")?

4. Who determines "the public's interest"?

Counseling and Advising Services - II

Group Leader: Francis U. Macy, Executive Director, Central New York Planning Consortium for the External Degree Program
Recorder: Fran Macy

I. Counseling external, adult students present very different problems than counseling resident college-age students.
- A. anxieties about ability
- B. uncertainty about goals
- C. impeachment of work and life problems

II. Counselors for adult external students should not be drawn from college and school counseling experience; should not be restricted by credentialing requirements.
- A. faculty
- B. married adults with non-academic employment experience
- C. community-based people with broad contacts among potential students
- D. experienced adult teachers and counselors (e.g. military, social agencies, etc.)

III. Role of counselor difficult to limit
- A. information dispensor
- B. program developer
- C. personal guidance (toughtest to limit)
- D. career and educational guidance inseparable
- E. learning problems often personal arising out of life situation
- F. more choices offered by external programs; the more counseling needed
- G. peer counseling/group counseling good
- H. should not be recruiters but advocates
- I. counselors important role in feedback to policy makers - only student contact in some external programs - know best potential clientele needs.

IV. Networks of referral agents and "adjunct" counselors should be developed especially for information dispensor role - need training.
- A. secretaries
- B. librarians
- C. social agency personnel

Counseling and Advising Services - II (continued)

D. employment agency personnel

Evaluation of Non-Traditional Degree Programs - III

Group Leader: John R. Valley, Co-Director, Office of New Degree Programs, Educational Testing Service
Recorder: Joe McFarland

1. How can evaluation be used as a tool to increase status of external degree programs? Are there dangers of evaluating external degree programs?

2. Who sets standards for external degree programs? Is there enough commonality among programs to permit establishment of common standards?

Assessment of Students - III

Group Leader: John Summerskill, Vice President, Educational Testing Service
Recorder: Ernie Kimmel

1. Does assessment apply differently to basic undergraduate education vs. professional certification expectations?

2. What is the purpose of assessment and evaluation? To help students learn to distinguish and make judgments? To judge students against an established set of criteria?

3. Where should authority for making assessment judgments originate?

4. Should colleges continue to do all assessment of student performance?

New Faculty Roles

Group Leader: John A. Valentine, Executive Secretary, Commission on Non-Traditional Study, College Entrance Examination Board
Recorder: Ellie Greenberg

I. Reference to Diversity by Design (by Valentine) and Commission on Non-Traditional Study
   A. Recommendations
      1. colleges and universities should be concerned for how people learn and servicing students rather than degrees
      2. professors use wide range of teaching and large resources
   B. Non-traditional study is an attitude - students 1st, institutions, 2nd. Students at center. Stresses competence, not time and space. Concentrate on student needs.
   C. New roles for faculty.
      1. assumption - new students with new needs; also regular students
      2. new course by Valentine - continuing education programs/assessment

and measurement by ETS. "The Guidance and Assessment of Non-traditional Learning". For college teachers, $450 for 4 days. Run once. Curriculum design in pamphlet. Three roles:

a. traditional course and content delivery
b. mentor role
c. individualize a particular course

E. Questions
1. What are the "other" new roles for faculty?
2. How do you bring about these roles in a viable way?

II. Discussion

A. Part-time adjunct faculty preferable to full-time faculty.
B. Faculty is scared. Faculty is "the enemy".
C. How do you develop individualized instructional programs in a cost frame that is palatable?
D. How do you re-train teachers?
1. should come out of state budget
2. very difficult
3. unionized faculty - more in future
4. takes time, not in one workshop
5. send faculty out to counsel
6. passive vs. activist students; need for peer/faculty roles
7. co-learner role
E. Need a new kind of person for external degree programs; need prestige and status.
F. The difference between facilitational role and instructional role: on campus faculty and field faculty.
G. Faculty Development Money - from state and institutional budgets
1. Pennsylvania - Institution for the Improvement of College Teaching Faculty
a. submit a plan and get released time for re-training
b. program plans include faculty participation
H. Diversity in teaching roles.
I. Diversity of delivery systems - where the teacher is one medium.
J. Need to teach faculty re the learning process.
K. Malcolm Knowles: The Adult Student - A Neglected Species.
L. Treat the teacher as a learner/student: will cost money.

CONFERENCE AGENDA

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1974

7:00 p.m.-10:00 p.m. Informal Reception
Hosted by President and Mrs. William W. Turnbull of the Educational Testing Service

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1974

8:30 a.m.- 9:00 a.m. Coffee and Registration

9:00 a.m.-10:00 a.m. Opening General Session
Greetings and Introductions:
Fred A. Nelson, Co-Director, Office of New Degree Programs, College Entrance Examination Board
Comments and Introduction of Speaker:
William W. Turnbull, President, Educational Testing Service
"Strategies for Educational Innovation"
Stephen K. Bailey, Vice President, American Council on Education

10:00 a.m.-10:30 a.m. Coffee Break

10:30 a.m.-12:00 noon Small Group Discussions - First Series

Evaluation of Non-Traditional Degree Programs
Group Leader: Leland K. Medsker, Project Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California

Assessment of Students
Group Leader: David E. Sweet, President, Minnesota Metropolitan State College

Cooperation Among Programs
Group Leader: Donald J. Nolan, Coordinator of Academic Programs in Higher Education, The University of the State of New York

Quality Control
Group Leader: Kay J. Andersen, Director, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Modes of Instruction
Group Leader: Caleb A. Lewis, Project Director, Courses by Newspaper, University of California Extension, San Diego

Remote Learning Centers
Group Leader: Thomas H. McGrath, Chairman, California State University and Colleges' Commission on External Degree Programs

12:00 noon- 1:30 p.m. Luncheon
Comments and introduction of speaker:
Patrick L. Healey, Academic Assistant to the Vice President, Extended Academic and Public Service Programs, University of California
"Stresses of Universalism"
Gerald P. Grant, Associate Professor of Sociology and Education, Syracuse University

1:30 p.m.- 3:00 p.m. Small Group Discussions - Second Series

Assessment of Students
Group Leader: James W. Hall, President, Empire State College

Remote Learning Centers
Group Leader: Peter P. Smith, Director
Community College of Vermont

Cooperation Among Programs
Group Leader: James D. Brown, President, Thomas A. Edison College

Counseling and Advising Services
Group Leader: Fred O. Pinkham, Director, Capital University Center

Funding of External Degree Programs
Group Leader: Alden Dunham, Executive Associate, Carnegie Corporation

Funding of External Degree Programs
Group Leader: Dale M. Heckman, Program Analyst
Department of Finance, State of California

3:00 p.m.- 3:30 p.m. Coffee Break

3:30 p.m.- 5:00 p.m. Small Group Discussions - Third Series

Evaluation of Non-Traditional Degree Programs
Group Leader: Leland K. Medsker, Project Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California

Evaluation of Non-Traditional Degree Programs
Group Leader: John R. Valley, Co-Director, Office of New Degree Programs, Educational Testing Service

Relationships to State Governments
Group Leaders: Bruce C. Fuller, Joint Committee on the Master Plan; and Kenneth B. O'Brien, California Coordinating Council for Higher Education

Counseling and Advising Services
Group Leader: Francis U. Macy, Executive Director, Central New York Planning Consortium for the External Degree Program

Funding of External Degree Programs
Group Leader: Adrienne Bailey, Program Associate, The Chicago Community Trust

Modes of Instruction
Group Leader: Kenneth S. Down, Director, Stanford Instructional Television Network

5:00 p.m.- 7:00 p.m. Social hour for participants and spouses
Hosted by the College Entrance Examination Board

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1974

8:30 a.m.- 9:00 a.m. Coffee

9:00 a.m.-10:00 a.m. General Session
Comments and Introduction of speaker:
Thomas H. McGrath, Chairman, California State University and Colleges' Commission on External Degree Programs
"An Interim Conference Report"
Cyril O. Houle, Professor of Education, The University of Chicago

10:30 a.m.-12:00 noon Small Group Discussions - Fourth Series

Assessment of Students
Group Leader: John Summerskill, Vice President, Educational Testing Service

Relationships to State Government
Group Leader: Assemblyman John Vasconcellos, California Legislature

Quality Control
Group Leader: Jerry Miller, Director, Office on Educational Credit, American Council on Education

Instructional Materials
Group Leader: Michael Neil, Director, The Open University, North American Office

New Faculty Roles
Group Leader: John A. Valentine, Executive Secretary, Commission on Non-Traditional Study, College Entrance Examination Board

12:00 noon- 2:00 p.m. Luncheon
"A Concluding Conference Statement"
Cyril O. Houle, Professor of Education, The University of Chicago

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

WESTERN CONFERENCE ON EXTERNAL DEGREE PROGRAMS
FEBRUARY 17-19, 1974

Dr. Kay J. Andersen
Executive Director
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Mills College
Oakland, California 94613

Dr. Adrienne Bailey
Program Associate
The Chicago Community Trust
208 La Salle Street
Suite 850
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Dr. Charles R. Borns
Associate Dean for Special Programs
Chaminade College of Honolulu
3140 Waialae Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816

Mr. Jack Bradford
Consultant to the Commission on Open University Affairs
Missouri Commission on Higher Education
600 Clark Avenue
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Dr. James D. Brown, Jr.
President
Thomas A. Edison College
1750 North Olden Avenue
Trenton, New Jersey 08638

Ms. Anne-Marie Carroll
Staff Associate
Commonwealth Task Force on the Open University
Massachusetts State College System
65 Franklin Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

Mrs. Doris Cassiday
Chairman
Board for State Academic Awards
State of Connecticut
340 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Mr. Joseph Conte
Field Studies Division
La Verne College
1960 Third Street
La Verne, California 91750

Mr. Kenneth S. Down
Director
Stanford Instructional Television Network
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Mr. E. Alden Dunham
Executive Associate
Carnegie Corporation
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Mr. Bruce C. Fuller
Assistant Consultant
Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education
State Capitol
Assembly Post Office Box 83
Sacramento, California 95814

Dr. Oakley Gordon
Dean, Continuing Education
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Mrs. Elinor Greenberg
Director
University Without Walls and
Other Special Projects
Loretto Heights College
3001 South Federal Boulevard
Denver, Colorado 80236

Dr. James W. Hall
President
Empire State College
State University of New York
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866

Dr. Milton J. Hassel
Director of Development
State University of Nebraska
1800 North 33rd Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68503

Mr. Dale Heckman
Program Review and Audit Division
Department of Finance
1026 "P" Street
Sacramento, California 95184

Dr. Walter E. Hunter
Director, Non-Traditional
Community College Project
Forest Park Community College
5600 Oakland Avenue, Room F 312
St. Louis, Missouri 63110

Mr. Ronald C. Lee
Dean, College of Special Programs
Golden Gate University
536 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94105

Mr. Caleb A. Lewis
Project Director
Courses by Newspaper
University of California Extension,
San Diego
Post Office Box 109
La Jolla, California 92037

Dr. Barbara A. Lowther
President
Lincoln State University
126 North Wright Street
Naperville, Illinois 60540

Dr. Mary K. Ludwig
Executive Director
Evening College-Summer Session
College of Continuing Education
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

Mr. Francis U. Macy
Executive Director
Central New York Planning Consortium
for the External Degree Program
109 Roney Lane
Syracuse, New York 13210

Mr. James C. McConahay
Assistant to the Vice President
Independent Study Programs
Pepperdine University
8035 South Vermont Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90044

Dr. Joseph McFarland
Director
Antioch College/West
149 Ninth Street
San Francisco, California 94103

Dr. Frederick R. Mayer
Director, Hawaii Open Program and
Associate Dean of Continuing Education
102 Krauss Hall
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Dr. Leland L. Medsker
Project Director
Nontraditional Education Study
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California
2150 Shattuck Avenue
Berkeley, California 94704

Dr. Barbara H. Mickey
Associate Vice President and
Dean of Academic Programs
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado 80639

Dr. Jerry Miller
Director
Office on Educational Credit
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 760
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Michael W. Neil
Director
The Open University
North American Office
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019

Dr. Donald J. Nolan
Coordinator of Academic Programs
in Higher Education
The University of the State of
New York
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12210

Dr. Kenneth B. O'Brien
Associate Director
Coordinating Council for Higher
Education
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dr. John F. O'Connell
Associate Dean
Resident Education Centers
Chapman College
333 North Glassell Street
Orange, California 92666

Dr. Jules O. Pagano
Dean of Special Programs
Florida International University
Miami, Florida 33144

Dr. Stanley A. Peterson
Dean, Division of Continuing
Education
Brigham Young University
222 HRCB
Provo, Utah 84601

Colonel John L. Phipps
President
Community College of the Air Force
Randolph Air Force Base, Texas
78148

Dr. Fred O. Pinkham
Director
Capital University Center
275 Windsor Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06120

Dr. Miles C. Romney
Vice Chancellor
Oregon State System of Higher
Education
Office of Academic Affairs
Post Office Box 3175
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dr. Bernard Sloan
Director
External Degree Project
University of Alabama
Post Office Box 3744
University, Alabama 35486

Mr. Peter P. Smith
Director
Community College of Vermont
Post Office Box 81
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Dr. David Sweet
President
Minnesota Metropolitan State
College
421 Wabash
St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

Dr. E. Nelson Swinerton
Planning Director
Regents Statewide University
University of Wisconsin System
1567 Deckner Avenue
Green Bay, Wisconsin 54302

Dr. Roy Troutt
Dean, College of Liberal Studies
University of Oklahoma
1700 Asp Avenue
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Mr. John R. Turner
Dean, Adult Degree Programs
Goddard College
Plainfield, Vermont 05667

Assemblyman John Vasconcellos
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Dr. Thomas L. Walters
Academic Dean
Lone Mountain College
3800 Turk Boulevard
San Francisco, California 94118

Ms. E. Anne Winchester
Deputy Coordinator
Council on Higher Education
State of Washington
980 East Fifth Street
Olympia, Washington 98504

Dr. John T. Yantis
Director
Institute for Personal and
Career Development
Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, Michigan 48858

Dr. Jerome M. Ziegler
Commissioner for Higher Education
State Board of Education for
the Commonwealth
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

SPONSOR PARTICIPANTS

The California State University and Colleges

Dr. Robert M. Bersi
Dean of Innovative Programs
and Institutional Development
California State College,
Dominguez Hills
1000 East Victoria Street
Dominguez Hills, California 90747

Dr. Martin R. Blyn
Director
Division of Management
California State College,
Dominguez Hills
1000 East Victoria Street
Dominguez Hills, California 90747

Dr. Leo F. Cain
President
California State College,
Dominguez Hills
1000 East Victoria Street
Dominguez Hills, California

Mr. Donald R. Gerth
Vice President for Academic
Affairs
California State University,
Chico
Chico, California 95926

Mr. C. Dale Johnson
Professor, Department of Sociology
San Diego State University
San Diego, California 92115

Ms. Ardath Lee
Professor, English Department
California State College, Sonoma
1801 E. Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, California 94928

Dr. George E. McCabe
Executive Secretary
The California State University and
Colleges' Commission on External
Degree Programs
1801 E. Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, California 94928

Dr. Thomas H. McGrath
President, California State College,
Sonoma
Chairman, Commission on External Degree
Programs, The California State
University and Colleges
1801 E. Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, California 94928

Mr. Richard Payne
Coordinator of Extension Services
California State University, Sacramento
6000 "J" Street
Sacramento, California 95819

Dr. Arthur Warmoth
Coordinator, External M.A. in Psychology
California State College, Sonoma
1801 E. Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, California 94928

The University of California

Dr. Shirley S. Chater
Project Director
School of Nursing N-605-y
University of California,
San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94122

Mr. Richard C. Dorf
Dean of Extended Learning
371 Mrak Hall
University of California, Davis
Davis, California

Mr. Leonard Freedman
Dean
Office of Extended Studies
UNEX Administration Building
University of California,
Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dr. Patrick L. Healey
Academic Assistant to the Vice
President
Extended Academic and Public Service
Programs
University of California
650 University Hall
Berkeley, California

Mr. Robert G. Jones
Assistant to the Vice President
Extended Academic and Public Service
Programs
University of California
650 University Hall
Berkeley, California 94720

Mr. Ronald J. McAllister
Chairman, Urban Studies
University of California, Riverside
P.O. Box 112
Riverside, California 92502

Dr. Joseph Zelan
Director of Research and Evaluation
Office of the Vice President
Extended Academic and Public Service
Programs
University of California
650 University Hall
Berkeley, California 94704

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD-EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE

Robert G. Cameron
Director
College Entrance Examination Board
800 Welch Road
Palo Alto, California 94304

John S. Helmick
Vice President
Educational Testing Service
1947 Center Street
Berkeley, California 94704

Ernest W. Kimmel
Program Director
Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Road
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Merritt C. Ludwig
Acting Executive Vice President
College Entrance Examination Board
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019

Fred A. Nelson
Co-Director
Office of New Degree Programs
College Entrance Examination Board
800 Welch Road
Palo Alto, California 94304

John Summerskill
Vice President
Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Road
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

William W. Turnbull
President
Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Road
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

John A. Valentine
Executive Secretary
Commission on Non-Traditional Study
College Entrance Examination Board
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019

John R. Valley
Co-Director
Office of New Degree Programs
Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Road
Princeton, New Jersey 08540